

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MICHAEL DONN BARTZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

MELINDA DERUS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

24-cv-398-wmc

On August 6, 2025, the court held a telephonic hearing on plaintiff Michael Donn Bartz's second motion to compel discovery responses. Dkt. 63. Bartz represented himself and defendants were represented by Assistant Attorney General Anureet Sandhu.

Before ruling on Bartz's motion, I addressed Bartz's concern regarding mail delays and missing documents. *See* Dkt. 66 at 2. Defense counsel summarized the information she received from the institution regarding inmate mail and mail delays and Bartz stated that he has found certified mail to be more reliable. I advised Bartz to keep records of what he mails and when, and to save copies of what he mails. I also advised him to use certified mail for time sensitive mailings. I explained the court would grant him reasonable extensions of time should he need them due to mailing delays.

I next discussed the meet-and-confer requirement with the parties in light of Bartz's claim that his letters and calls were often unanswered. Defense counsel explained that she preferred to exchange letters regarding discovery disputes, but this is not always sufficient to properly meet and confer, and letters are often not as expeditious or effective as phone calls. Going forward, I ordered the following procedures: Bartz must send a letter to defense counsel outlining issues with discovery and requesting a response within three weeks. Defense counsel

must respond in some fashion within the timeframe, either by letter response, supplementation, or by setting up a phone call with the institution. If Bartz does not receive a response within the three-week window, he may file a motion.

I then ruled on Bartz's second motion to compel as follows for the reasons stated on the record:

- Bartz's request to compel supplemental responses to Interrogatories Nos. 2a-2d is DENIED as moot.
- Bartz's request to compel supplemental responses to Interrogatory No. 3b is GRANTED. Defendants must provide their supplemental responses within 21 days of this order.
- Bartz's request to compel supplemental responses to Interrogatories Nos. 4a-4p is DENIED.
- Bartz's request to compel defendants to produce certain records in response to Request for Production No. 1 is DENIED.
- Bartz's request to compel defendants to produce all documents they relied on in answering Bartz's second set of interrogatories is WITHDRAWN.

Bartz's second motion to compel, Dkt. 63, is therefore GRANTED in part and DENIED in part as noted above.

Entered August 6, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

ANITA MARIE BOOR
Magistrate Judge